

The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office 214 E. Main Street,
Washington Bureau 601 14th St. N. W.,
Memphis Bureau 1109 Hull Street,
Petersburg Bureau No. 40 N. Sycamore St.,
Lynchburg Bureau 215 Eighth St.

BY MAIL. One Six Three One
POSTAGE PAID. Year. Mo. M. M. M.
Daily, with Sunday \$5.00 \$5.00 \$1.00
Daily, without Sunday 4.00 2.00 1.00
Sunday only 2.00 1.00 .50
Weekly (Wednesday) 1.00 .50 .25

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service
in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester and
Petersburg—
One Week. One Year.
Daily, with Sunday 14 cents \$1.00
Daily, without Sunday 12 cents .85
Sunday only 5 cents .25
(Carriage subscriptions payable in advance.)

Entered, January 27, 1902, at Richmond, Va.,
as second-class matter, under act of Congress
of March 3, 1879.

HOW TO CALL TIMES-DISPATCH.

Persons wishing to communicate with The
Times-Dispatch by telephone will ask central
for "441," and on being answered from the
office switchboard, will indicate the depart-
ment or person with whom they wish to speak.
When calling between 4 A. M. and 9 A. M., the
call to central office direct for 441, composing
room; 442, business office; 443, for mailing
and press rooms.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1907.

It is not our beliefs that brighten
us half so much as our fancies.
—Holmes.

A Call to the Rich.

The Y. M. C. A. fund new amounts to
\$112,000. Of this \$62,500 is in subscrip-
tions of \$1,000 and upward; the rest in
small subscriptions.

The men in moderate circumstances
are doing well; many of the rich men
are doing poorly. If the rich would do
as well in proportion as the poor, the
full \$200,000 would be raised in short
order. In the Richmond subscriptions
there are:

One of \$20,000.
One of \$15,000.
Two of \$5,000 each.
One of \$2,000.
One of \$1,500.
Fourteen of \$1,000 each.
In the little town of Pottsville, Pa.,
which raised a subscription of \$100,000,
there were:
One subscription of \$25,000.
One subscription of \$20,000.
One subscription of \$10,000.
Nine subscriptions of \$4,000 each.
Comparisons may be odious, but they
are instructive.

The case is now up to the rich men
of the city. Four or five \$5,000 sub-
scriptions would put new life into the
movement and save the day. There are
plenty of men abundantly able to give
that sum to this great cause. Their
generosity and their local pride are ap-
pealed to. Will they respond?

It was said on the streets yesterday
that the fire would hurt the campaign.
Why? Baltimore had just come out of
a holocaust when she made her subscrip-
tion. Richmond narrowly escaped a simi-
lar fate. It seems to us that it is
Richmond's duty to make a thank-offering
for her escape.

It may be that the fire was a ben-
ign suggestion to us from Providence
to be generous.

The South's Greatest Need.

Dr. Walter Page sounded the keynote
when he said in his recent address in
Richmond that if this country would
prosper as it should, and if its democ-
racy was to attain anything like per-
fection, education must take a more
practical turn.

Mr. James R. Garfield made much
the same observation in a later speech
in New York.

"In this country," said he, "we have
too much discussion of the rights of
citizenship and too little discussion of
the duties of citizenship. It sometimes
seems to me that our form of education
has placed a false standard on intel-
lectual and industrial life. It has made
our men and women believe that manual
labor is not dignified, while as a fact
we should all recognize that a great
majority of our citizens have to earn
their living by honest manual labor.
American men and women must come
out of college equipped to do practical
things."

This change must be brought about
by a change in public sentiment. We
must get rid of our silly notion that it
is more respectable to be a professional
man than to be a mechanic. We must
not judge a man by his occupation, but
by his character and his usefulness.
But that is not all. We must give our
boys at school the opportunity to learn
a good trade and to learn it well.
There is an active and growing demand
for skilled workmen and the pay is high.
The South is rich in materials for manu-
facturing purposes, and her lands are
productive. But she needs skilled me-
chanics and scientific farmers. She
should not depend on other sections or
foreign lands for them. She should take
her own boys and train them to the
work.

What Is a Traitor?

In the course of his address at Wash-
ington and Lee University, Mr. Charles
Frances Adams said that the charge last
most commonly made against General Lee
in Massachusetts is that he was a
military traitor. Some of our contem-
poraries think that it was in bad taste
for Mr. Adams even to have mentioned
such a charge in the presence of a Vir-
ginia audience. But they probably labor
under a misconception. We are in the
habit of thinking of a traitor as a man
who deserts his flag and basely betrays
his country for a price. When we think
of traitor we usually think of Benedict
Arnold. Mr. Adams did not, of course,
employ the term in that sense, for no
man at the North whose opinion is worth
attention is fool enough to say that Gen-
eral Lee was a traitor in any such sense.
Mr. Adams was speaking in a technical
sense only, but was not so explicit as he

was on a former occasion. In an ad-
dress delivered in Chicago in 1902, he
said:

"Was Robert E. Lee a traitor? Techni-
cally, I think he was indisputably a
traitor to the United States; for a traitor,
as I understand it technically, is one
guilty of the crime of treason; or, as the
Century Dictionary puts it, violating his
allegiance to the chief authority of the
State; while treason against the United
States is specifically defined in the Con-
stitution as 'levying war' against it, or
'giving their enemies aid and comfort.'
That Robert E. Lee did levy war against
the United States can, I suppose, no more
be denied than that he gave 'aid and
comfort' to its enemies. This technically;
but, in history, there is treason and
treason, as there are traitors and
traitors. And, furthermore, if Robert E.
Lee was a traitor, so also, and indis-
putably, were George Washington, Oliver
Cromwell, John Hampden, and William of
Orange. The list might be extended in-
definitely; but there will suffice. There
can be no question that every one of
those named violated his allegiance, and
gave aid and comfort to the enemies of
his sovereign. Washington furnishes a
precedent at every point. A Virginian,
like Lee, was also a British subject;
he had fought under the British flag; as
Lee had fought under that of the United
States; when, in 1776, Virginia seceded
from the British empire, he went with
his State; just as Lee went with it
eighty-five years later; subsequently
Washington commanded armies in the
field as 'rebels' and whose descen-
dants now glorify them as the 'rebels
of '76,' much as Lee later commanded,
and at last surrendered, much larger
armies, also designated 'rebels' by those
they confronted. Except in their out-
come, the cases were, therefore, precisely
alike; and logic is logic. It consequently
appears to follow that, if Lee was a
traitor, Washington was also."

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and emolument in the
United States Army.

The moral question is not involved, and
Mr. Adams was not discussing it, for
he said in his Lexington speech that in
the same situation he would have done
exactly as Lee did. Our only fault with
the argument of Mr. Adams is that he
did not go far enough. We shall never
agree that General Lee was a traitor
even in a technical sense. The mis-
take which Mr. Adams makes is in pre-
suming that General Lee was a citizen
of the United States; that the United
States was primarily his country, and that
his allegiance was primarily to the Fed-
eral government. The fact is that Gen-
eral Lee was born a citizen of Virginia,
and he had no other citizenship in law.
The law prescribed how a citizen of
Virginia might give up his citizenship
in this State, but General Lee had never
done such a thing. Notwithstanding he
was an officer in the United States Army,
he was a citizen of Virginia. Virginia
was "his country," and he owed his al-
legiance to Virginia. When Virginia
withdrew from the Union, he was in
duty bound to go with her; and techni-
cally, as well as morally, he would have
been a traitor to his State if he had
"violated his allegiance," and deserted
Virginia in order to attain a position
of prominence and